

especially after the OPEC oil price increase in October, 1973.

● (2100)

Although the outlook for the future appears dismal when one considers the lack of substitute energy forms, there is one very worth-while step that not only can but must be taken now, that is, to increase public awareness of the need to conserve energy. Every incentive must be offered to encourage a more responsible use of our energy resources. Unfortunately increased cost has proven to be the most effective incentive.

Significant increments in supply can be realized by lowering thermostats a few degrees and driving our cars only when really necessary, and then at lower speeds and with more efficient engines. Conservation is a priority before we begin to discuss new sources of energy to replace those we are using up at an unsustainable rate. Conservation is now. It is the immediate solution which will buy time until the other solutions can be implemented.

Hopefully it is becoming apparent to all Canadians that the federal government is not an endless source of funds ready to save publicly-funded enterprises or other governments within Canada from the excesses of poor management. Whether we are discussing electricity rates in the Atlantic provinces or the cost of the Olympic Games, the same problem emerges. The government has a responsibility to the taxpayers of Canada to ensure that their money is used in a responsible manner.

The hon. member for Don Valley wants more money for research and development. I entirely agree. It is one of the things I have been stressing for some time. But we cannot complain; in this time of restraint and budget cutting the government recently announced an increase of \$9.7 million in funds available for energy research and development. This indicates how high a priority the government places on this line of endeavour. I understand, too, the provision of additional funds is presently under consideration in connection with the fusion program.

The hon. member wanted the government to change its priorities. He did not elaborate on that theme, but I would be very interested to hear what his priorities happen to be and how they happen to differ from those set out in government policy which are almost identical to what was suggested almost a year ago by the Science Council, an independent group to which the best brains in the country contribute. What does the hon. member or his party know that the best talent in the country doesn't?

As indicated both by government policy and by the conclusions of the Science Council, in the short term, conservation will buy us time and reduce demand. We will increase supply in the short term by using coal and nuclear fission. No new technology is needed in these fields; it is a matter of implementing what we already have. In the intermediate term, the oil and gas resources of the tar sands, the Arctic and the Atlantic offshore regions should be brought to the market place. In the long term, solar energy and energy from fusion should be the largest suppliers of our energy needs, but this will not be until the end of the present century. Energy produced as a result of novel techniques; e.g. wind, biomass, geothermal and tidal

Energy

sources will not make any significant contribution until the end of the century.

The hon. member for Moncton (Mr. Jones) proposed the early use of tidal energy. He mentioned the several studies which have been carried out in this connection. Studies have certainly been made, but their conclusion is that it is not economic to proceed with such projects at the present time. Even if a decision were made to begin such a scheme today it would be many years before we could expect energy to be derived from that source.

The hon. member for Moncton also commented on insulation standards in his province. I happen to know that in his own riding there is an insulation factory under construction right now but the project has been delayed for many months because there has been no increased demand for insulation in that part of the country. The standards may exist but they are certainly not being implemented. Conservation is for now. Now is the time to save energy while we bring more energy on stream to supply our future needs.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down will be happy reading for Mr. Regan, the Premier of Nova Scotia, as an indication of the tremendous support his Liberal allies are giving to his province. It might have come from the back benches but that speech was applauded by everyone on the Liberal side. It was prepared and, we must assume, researched prior to delivery. It was not an off-the-cuff statement. It was Liberal policy and must be considered as such in view of the way in which it was presented.

The hon. member mentioned energy from wind. I do not want to speak in a derogatory way about anyone who advocates the conservation of energy or the exploitation of new forms of energy, but it might be of interest to the hon. member to learn that wind energy is so important in the Atlantic area that when a meeting connected with the preservation of the environment was held last week in New Brunswick they tried to run their PA system by means of batteries charged by a wind-driven generator. Their meeting was constantly interrupted because the fan failed to run; it did not generate any energy, the batteries ran down. That sort of situation, I suppose, is one to which he would relegate the Atlantic region. It is typical of Liberal party policy, historically and traditionally, to take that kind of position as their supporters look eastward.

Mr. Forrestall: Exactly so. It reminds me of what Mackenzie King said—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. The hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain) has the floor. If the hon. member wishes to make a speech he can make it later on.

Mr. McCain: My hon. friend may be disturbing, but at least he has his feet on the ground and he has some knowledge of the requirements of the Atlantic provinces. He is therefore far ahead of some of those on your right, Mr. Speaker.

I suppose we might go to biomass as was suggested by the last speaker, but this is an alternative which has not